

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,561	12/08/2003	Sharad K. Govil	MTI 3.0-025 DIV DIV	4254
530	7590 07/25/2005		EXAMINER	
	DAVID, LITTENE	WEBMAN, EDWARD J		
	KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST			PAPER NUMBER
WESTFIEL	O, NJ 07090		1616	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/730,561	GOVIL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Edward J. Webman	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 May 2005</u> .						
·	· <u> </u>					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-121 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-28 and 67-121 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/22/04,3/24/04, 11/9/04-	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1616

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 5/5/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no burden. This is not found persuasive because the groups are classified in entirely different classes.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 67-99, 103, 114, 121 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miranda et al (US 5,474,783).

Miranda et al teach a transdermal comprising a drug, an acrylate polymer and a polysiloxane (abstract). 2-96% polyacrylate and 98-4% polysiloxane is disclosed (column 4 lines 10-12). The acrylate polymer is composed of at least 50% alkyl acrylate monomer (column 9 lines 38-40). Butyl acryate is disclosed (column 9 line 44). The drug is 0.3-50% of the composition (column 8 line 67-column 9 line 2). Selegiline (al liquid) and propranolol are disclosed (column 10 line 53 and column 11 line 29). 0-30%

Art Unit: 1616

cosolvents, including propylene glycol and alcohols, are disclosed (column 13 line 43-51, Table II).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to make a composition comprising an acrylate to deliver selegiline to achieve the beneficial effect of transdermal delivery in view of Miranda et al. As to the claimed hydrophobic acrylic polymer, Miranda et al teach at least 50% butyl acrylate as cited above, which renders the polymer hydrophilic. This polymer meets the limitations of claim 89, 94, 103 and 114 because applicants' two claimed monomers, namely a C1-C4 alkyl acrylate and a C4-C12 alkyl acrylate, collapse to one monomer for C4 because the ranges overlap for C4. As to the claimed drying temperature of 100 degrees F, propylene glycol has a boiling point exceeding that.

Claims 67-70, 72, 76-79, 81, 85-99, 101-110, 112-121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sablotsky (US 4,994,267).

Sablotsky teaches a transdermal comprising an acrylic polymer, a synthetic rubber, and a crosslinking agent (abstract). 5-95% acrylic polymer is specified (column 3 line 68-column 4 lines 1-2). At least 50% alkyl acrylate is specified (column 4 lines 20-21). Butyl acrylate is disclosed (column 4 lines 24-25). Polyisobutylene is disclosed as a rubber (column 5 lines 30-37). Nitroglycerin (a liquid), diltiazem, and propranolol are specified as drugs (column 5 lines 65-6 68). 0.1-50% drug is disclosed (column 6 lines 38-39). Melamine formaldehyde resin is disclosed as a crosslinker (column 6 lines

Art Unit: 1616

63-64). Cosolvents, including propylene glycol and alcohols, are disclosed (column 7 lines 58-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to make a composition comprising an acrylate to deliver a drug to achieve the beneficial effect of transdermal delivery in view of Sablotsky. The statements following the first 103 motivation to combine are incorporated herein as applied to Sablotsky.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-28, 67-70, 72-73, 76-79, 81, 82, 103-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lhila et al (US 5,498,417).

Lhila et al teach a transdermal comprising a pressure-sensitive adhesive (abstract). Gelva 788 [disclosed in applicants' specification in example 15 and tables II and III] is specified (column 2 line 26). 25-90% polymer is disclosed (column 2 lines 28-30). 0.5%-15% each of triethanolamine and glycerol or polyalkylene glycol are disclosed (column 2 lines 39-52). Propylene glycol is specified (claim 1). 10-60% active is disclosed (column 2 lines 33-35).

Claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-28, 67-84, 94-121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolter et al (US 5,462,746).

Art Unit: 1616

Wolter et al teach a transdermal comprising an adhesive, a drug or salt thereof, and, when the salt is present, an element containing basic groups (abstract). Deprenyl (selegeline) is disclosed (column 3 line 44). Ethyl acetate is specified (column 4 line 64). Glycerol is disclosed (column 2 line 55). DURO-TAK 2516 [disclosed in applicants' specification in Table III as an acrylate polymer comprising ethylhexyl acrylate and methyl acrylate, crosslinked with aluminum] is specified (column 5 line 9). Polydimethylaminoethyl methacrylate (Eudragit E) is disclosed (column 5 line 1-3). Propanalol and verapamil are specified. Ethanol is disclosed (column 5 lines 10-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to make a composition comprising deprenyl and an acrylate polymer to achieve the beneficial effect of transdermal delivery in view of Wolter et al. As to the claimed acrylate polymer, deprotonating agent, drug and solvent, it is argued that the composition is achieved when the drug and solvent of Wolter et al enter the matrix of DUROTAK 2516 and Eudragit E (see column 4 line 57-column 5 line 25). As to the claimed percent ranges of of acrylate polymer and drug, Wolter et al teach suitable amounts. Absent a showing of criticality, optimum suitable amounts may be obtained by routine experimentation.

Claims 11, 103, 109, 112, 119, 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 11 "acetate" is vague; which acetates? In claim 103 and 119 "a monomer" is vague; what kind? In claim 109 "noniquous" in indefinite. In claims 112

Application/Control Number: 10/730,561 Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

and 120, "crosslinking agent" is redundant because both claims depend from claim 101 which also claims a crosslinking agent.

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 571-272-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, G. Kunz, can be reached on 571-272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD J. WEBMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1500